



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. V.—*On the Language of the Afghans.*—By Viscount
STRANGFORD.—Part I.

IN 1839 the British Government committed itself to an undertaking which practically amounted to the conquest, military occupation, and civil administration of a remote mountain land, inhabited by a savage and warlike race, animated by the strongest feelings of nationality. Yet it was all but wholly unprovided with the means of acquiring or imparting a knowledge of the difficult and peculiar language in which that nationality found its strongest expression and support. Such knowledge, indeed, was not absolutely indispensable for the purposes of official or social intercourse and correspondence. The requirements of current business were sufficiently met by the employment of Persian, generally known among the educated classes of Afghans, and strictly vernacular with that large population of Afghanistan which is Persian in its origin and Shiah by religion. But the inner life and distinctive character of the Afghans remained a sealed book for want of a knowledge of Pushtu. A vocabulary inserted at the end of Mounstuart Elphinstone's travels, a translation of the New Testament into Pushtu, and a brief grammatical sketch and vocabulary by Major Leach, constituted at that time the whole of the materials accessible to the English or Anglo-Indian student desirous of making himself acquainted with this language. These were scanty in amount, of little use for practical purposes, and of not much intrinsic value. The translation of the Testament was executed with haste and carelessness; and, though every allowance must be made for the zeal of the translators and the difficulties of a little-known, and, to them, uncultivated language, with the literature of which they were evidently unacquainted, such an error as the often-quoted rendering of "Judge not, that ye be not judged," by words meaning "Do not practice equity, lest equity be practised towards you," was more than mere inaccuracy in Pushtu, as it indicates fundamental ignorance of the real meaning of *insāf*, a word universal and of quite common and vernacular use in every language spoken by Mahometans. Leach's grammatical sketch goes a very little

way in facilitating the student's progress, being slight, imperfect, and not always accurate or consistent in rendering Afghan sounds into Roman letters; but his dialogues are original, animated, and apparently idiomatic. An ode of Rahman, subjoined to his sketch, is so disfigured with bad misprints that it is of no use to any one who is not proficient enough to restore the text by means of the translation at the side: in other words, it is useless to a learner. As this work bears the official countersign of Mr. Torrens, certifying it to be a "true copy," the responsibility of these misprints must be borne at least as much by the censor as by the author. The late Dr. Leyden appears at one time to have turned his attention to Pushtu, and to have succeeded in adding some knowledge of that language to his other great and varied accomplishments. A memoir by him on the Roshenian sect, in the 11th volume of the *Asiatic Researches*, contains some extracts from the *Makhzan i Pushtu*, the earliest extant work in the language,¹ and the main authority for his subject. This, however, was not philology, and he added nothing to our knowledge of the language. A gallant and distinguished officer, Lieutenant Loveday, whose barbarous murder, at the instigation of the dispossessed Khan of Khelat, caused a deep and painful sensation in England at the time, is understood to have contemplated a systematic study of Pushtu, with a view to publishing the result; a project which was abruptly stopped by his untimely death.

It must not be supposed that the same neglect or disregard of the claims of the Pushtu language, which so markedly characterized the period at which our political relations with the Afghan states acquired a sudden and prominent importance, had always prevailed among the authorities in India. Early in the century the East India Company, always the ready and munificent patron of Oriental studies, authorized a learned native gentleman, Mohabbet Khan, son of the famous Rohilla chief, Hafiz Rahmat Khan, to draw up a grammatical sketch of Pushtu, together with a vocabulary, the whole being written and explained in Persian. No current practical use appears to have been made of this work in India; but two copies of it were found by Professor Dorn of St. Petersburg in the East India Company's Library in London, and the learned Professor was thereby supplied with the groundwork of

¹ Captain Raverty, however, in a letter contained in the "*News of the Churches*," of February 1st, 1861, mentions the existence of at least two older works, of one of which, the "*History of the Yusufzai Tribe*," he was able to obtain a copy.

his subsequent valuable labours in the field of Pushtu grammar, a study which he was the first to establish on anything like an accurate and scientific basis.

From the commencement of the century, continental philologists had begun to include the Pushtu among the objects of their research. Owing to the scantiness of the material upon which they had to work, their labours were mostly imperfect and untrustworthy, and are described by subsequent investigators as abounding in errors. The researches of this period are represented by the Afghan portion of Klaproth's *Asia Polyglotta*, and by the treatises of Eversmann and Wilken. A marked improvement on these was a brief notice by Ewald, in which the great Semitic scholar pronounced decisively upon the 'un-Semitic character of the language, which, indeed, no philologist, with any genuine materials before him, could fail in perceiving at a glance.

But Professor Dorn was the first to publish *in extenso* a real grammar and vocabulary of the language, and to determine its true philological character and affinities with accuracy in detail. Not having lived in the country, however, and having had few or no opportunities of acquiring the language in a living form by oral and vernacular intercourse with natives, his works are described by Captain Raverty as not being wholly free from error, at least in their lexicographical portion, where the meanings of several Afghan words are stated to be merely "guessed at." Considering the comparative want of resources at the Professor's command, it is more to be wondered at that so much precision and accuracy should have been attained, and that Captain Raverty, a ready censurer of the errors and shortcomings of his precursors, should have found so little cause of complaint.

Our associate, Captain Richard Burton, the celebrated traveller, contributed an interesting article upon Professor Dorn's work to the proceedings of the Bombay Asiatic Society for 1849, in which, from his having acquired both a literary and a vernacular knowledge of Pushtu during his service in Upper Sindh, he was able to supply many valuable additions and corrections to the work in question.

The first Pushtu Grammar written in English, and containing more than a mere outline of the rules of the language, is the useful and unpretending little work of Colonel Vaughan, published at Calcutta in 1854, and followed in 1855 by a second volume, containing an English-Pushtu vocabulary. This work is entirely practical, and does not meddle with philology or grammatical

theory; its use, therefore, is less for the comparative philologist or the ambitious student of Afghan literature than for the soldier or the man of business desirous of obtaining a knowledge of the elementary rules and common words of the language by a simple and easy method. Its accuracy, though not unimpeachable, is quite sufficient for the ordinary purposes of business, or the rough and ready wants of the officer; and it only requires more idiomatic phrases and dialogues to be pronounced by far the most practically useful, if not the most theoretically perfect, of existing Afghan Grammars. Colonel Vaughan's Grammar was immediately followed by Captain Raverty's more complete work. It is to the latter gentleman that the credit undoubtedly belongs of being the first student to combine a mastery of vernacular Pushtu, acquired upon Afghan ground, with a thorough knowledge of its literature—a literature far more extensive in its records, and of greater intrinsic merit, than is generally supposed, even among Orientalists. He has communicated to the public the results of many years' labour in a series of works apparently intended to comprise the whole subject of the Pushtu language and literature in all its branches. These works consist of a full grammar of the language, which has reached a second edition; of a dictionary, Pushtu and English, having the advantage of a transcription of the Pushtu words in Roman letters; of a Chrestomathy, or series of selections from the prose and poetical writings of the best authors; and of a literal English version of the poetical portion of the last-mentioned work, preceded by a popular introduction to the subject. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the system upon which Captain Raverty has deemed it advisable to construct his grammar and explain its rules, it is probably beyond doubt that his works contain a complete and trustworthy record of all its actual facts; and it is in this point that the real value of these works lies. The accumulation of materials by the linguist is a matter of primary necessity to the philologist, without which the latter is unable to pursue his science with any prospect of success; and in the present case his gratitude is fairly due to Captain Raverty for the ample store of such material which he has placed at the disposal of the learned public at home and abroad.

When the linguist who is no philologist, but has mastered a language by rule of thumb or routine study, contents himself with a plain statement of the grammatical facts of that language, respects the limits of his own and his fellow-workman's art, and refrains from dogmatizing on those problems in philology and

ethnology which lie beyond those limits, he acquires the good-will of his readers, and the voice of censure or criticism passes over his occasional slips or mistakes in silence. It is quite allowable in a writer upon language at Peshawar, who has lived most of his life cut off from Europe, to treat M. Klaproth, who died some thirty years ago, as a living author, or to be manifestly ignorant of the processes and chief results of the science of comparative philology. But if he lends the weight of a name and authority fairly earned by the successful cultivation of one branch of study to the reiteration of baseless, untenable, and exploded theories in ethnology, the utter futility of which a proper view of his own special study should have led him to perceive, and to the support and propagation of such theories by arguments of his own, wholly unworthy of serious consideration, he incurs a heavy responsibility, and he has no right to complain if he becomes the object of severe comment. These remarks are unavoidable in the presence of Captain Raverty's various prefaces to his works, especially that to his Grammar, and of a very able paper by Dr. Löwenthal, a missionary at Peshawar, which appeared in the *Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society* for 1860 (No. IV.), under the title of "Is the Pushtu a Semitic Language?," animadverting in detail upon the arguments contained in the above prefaces, where Captain Raverty makes himself the advocate of that curious delusion, the Semitic character of the Afghan language and the Jewish origin of the Afghans. Incidentally, the Doctor has brought forward many new and most valuable illustrations of the Pushtu phonetic system and vocabulary, as also, in a less degree, of its forms; and it is therefore all the more to be regretted that he should have been thus forced to treat this really necessary and important branch of inquiry as an object secondary to the refutation of an absurd theory, in which no one capable of appreciating his arguments now believes, and the believers in which seem to be proof against his or any other man's demonstration.

"Error is immortal," says Dr. Löwenthal, with perfect truth, and it would therefore be sheer waste of time to try and kill the Semitic theory, or to gainsay a writer like the Rev. Mr. Forster, when he tells us that "āsmān" is a Pushtu word, derived from the Hebrew "samīān" (*sic*) with the article "hesamin" (*sic*); that "ōr" is Pushtu for "light" (which it is not), as in Hebrew; that the Hebrew "nahar," "a river," is contained, in that sense, in a Pushtu compound (not a word of which is true); and that therefore the Pushtu is a Semitic language. It is more to the purpose to inquire

how Sir William Jones came to countenance this theory, as he unquestionably may be said to have countenanced it, when he stated the Pushtu to be an actual dialect of Chaldee. It is probable that his opinion, in the first place, was uttered more or less at random, and was hastily conceived, without more than a mere cursory examination of the language. In the second place, one or two remarkable, though superficial and accidental, coincidences do really exist. The genitive is formed in Chaldee by a prefixed *dî* or *dî*, in Pushtu by *da*. They are wholly unconnected in origin, as the Chaldee word is simply the Aramaic relative pronoun, while the Pushtu word is probably part of the demonstrative pronoun *dagha*.¹ Dr. Löwenthal compares it with the Latin *de* and the Polish *od*; referring both—the former, after Bopp, conjecturally—the latter, with certainty, to the Sanskrit *adhas*. The demonstrative pronouns, moreover, are not unlike in the two languages at first sight. The Chaldee *dēk*, *dēn*, *hādēn*, *dāk*, *dā*, masc. and fem. “this,” resemble the Pushtu pronouns *hagha*, *dagha*, on the surface, but are of quite different origin. Rawlinson compares *hagha* with a presumed Zend from *hakha*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *sasva*; but as the Pushtu *gh* rarely, if ever, answers elsewhere to the Zend *q* or *kh*, *gha* is more probably a mere phonetic or inorganic increment, while the *da*- and *ha*- are no doubt respectively cognate with the Zend demonstrative *ha*, Sansk. *sa*, and the Zend and old Persian base *da*, found in the enclitic pronouns *-dim*, *-dis*, in the inscriptions *-dēsh*. Whether these dental bases, which are found both in the Semitic and the Aryan languages, be real instances of primeval connection or mere accidental coincidences, is a question to be determined only by Semitic and Aryan philologists of the highest authority and experience respectively, such as Ewald and Müller: it is, at all events, quite certain they are no evidence whatever of special and distinctive affinity between the Semitic languages and Pushtu. The word *or*, “fire,” probably reminded Sir William of the well known Semitic word for light, and it is possible, though not probable, that he may have remarked a curious resemblance to the ordinary process of

¹ Dr. Trumpp compares it with the Punjabi postfix *da*, which he shows to be originally an ablative derived from the Prakrit *do*, itself a corruption of the Sanskrit *-tas*. It is more convenient, however, to assign Pushtu forms to a native and Iranian origin, as long as it is possible to do so without violent assumptions. *Hagha* is also found in Assyrian in exactly the same form, but in the sense of the near, not, as in Pushtu, the remote demonstrative. *Ha*- is, without doubt, the Zend *hā*. Sanskrit *sa*, old Persian *ha-wa* (Sk. *sa-sva*), whence the Persian *ō*, in modern pronunciation *ā*.

formation or derivation of words in Arabic in such instances as the Pushtu *tōr*, black, *tiāra*, blackness: a change not easily explained, from our not possessing the Pushtu language in any other than a quite modern form, and our having, therefore, but limited means of comparison. The above examples, it may be said, constitute the amount of those "treacherous indications," to use the words of Dr. Dorn, which misled the great linguist and man of letters into the hasty utterance of an opinion which has been employed to shelter idle theories that its gifted author would have been the first to disavow and refute, had he lived long enough to become acquainted with the modern science of Comparative Philology, of which he himself unconsciously helped to lay the foundations.

It may be worth while here to call attention to the undue stress which has been laid upon the so-called native tradition of the Afghans, connecting them with King Saul, son of Kish, and upon the name of Beni Israil, which they are said to give themselves, at the same time that they reject the title of Yahudi. This affiliation of themselves upon a historical personage of the Old Testament is in their case looked upon as an exceptional and unique phenomenon, instead of being, as it really is, the rule in all analogous cases. Wherever a rude and uncultivated people have been brought within the pale of Islam, they have never failed to connect themselves with the traditionary quasi-Biblical ethnology of their conquerors or spiritual instructors through some patriarch or hero of Scripture, the knowledge of whom was derived by the early Mussulmans from corrupt Jewish sources. Thus the old Turkish traditions of Central Asia make an eponymus for that race after the usual process, out of its own national title, and connect them with Japhet under the name of *Yafet oghlan Turk*, Turk son of Japhet: and the Berbers or Amazigh of North Africa make eponymy out of their native and their Arabic names, and affiliate themselves upon Ber, son of Mazigh, nephew of Canaan, grandson of Ham. The Persian civilization and native religious and heroic traditions were far too strong and deep seated to yield to this process, and in Persia, accordingly, there are no traces of it to be met with. As for Beni Israil, it is obviously, and on the face of it, a mere Molla's Arabic phrase, derived from books, and, therefore, those who represent it as a national title prior to, and independent of, Mahometan influence, do what is equivalent to putting Latin words with a Latin construction into the mouths of the Highland clans of Scotland previous to the Christian era.

The most complete analogy to this so-called Pushtu tradition is

furnished by that of the Gipsies, which affords, perhaps, the most perfect and typical example of a spurious and insitive tradition, as opposed to a genuine home-grown one, having been instantly and universally adopted by a race from its neighbours, and by it passed off in turn upon the latter as being really its own. In every country of Western Europe where the Gipsies made their first appearance during the course of the fifteenth century, their invariable reply to all questions as to their race and origin was the legend that they were the descendants of Egyptians who had inhospitably driven the Virgin Mary from their doors. On the faith of this, their Egyptian origin was always recognised in Europe as a matter of orthodox belief, until Grellman published his researches based upon an investigation of their language; and this delusive belief stands recorded in three extreme points of Europe, by the English, Spanish, and modern Greek names of this race, *Gipsy*, *Gitano*, *Γύπτος*. The legend is not found among any Asiatic Gipsies, and was manifestly forced into the mouths of the European wanderers by the leading questions of their Christian interrogators. It vanished into air at once before the first examination of the Gipsy language, from which we are now enabled to know not only whence they came, but from what particular part of India they came, and through what countries of Western Asia and Eastern Europe they passed on their way to the west. The strong elements of Persian, Byzantine Greek, and Wallachian, which their language contains, suffice to show their route as clearly as a written itinerary. The acquired and spurious tradition of the Jewish origin of the Afghans appears to have its exact parallel in the above fable of the Egyptian origin of the Gipsies. It would be an interesting inquiry to ascertain how far the former is really current among the Afghans, and whether it is to be met with at all among the clansmen and primitive classes, living comparatively out of the reach of the influence of Mollas.

It is impossible to conclude this brief notice of the Jewish or Semitic theory without expressing great regret that Captain Raverty should have thought it answered any practical or scientific end to support his paradoxes with regard to the language by arguments derived from the fact that numerous Arabic words are contained in the Afghan vocabulary, and from the use of the technical terms of Arabic grammar in the treatment of their own language by Afghan grammarians. If Pushtu be Semitic for the former of these reasons, so is every language spoken by populations professing Mahometanism; if for the latter reason, so is every language that has ever been grammatically taught and cultivated

by Mahometans; and we therefore must fain look on Persian and Turkish, Malay and Mandingo language, French and modern Greek as comprised, one and all, in the category of uniform Semitism, on the strength of their being expounded by Turkish, Arab, or native teachers, through the technical apparatus of *ism* and *fi'l*, and *māzi* and *muzāri*.

The real fact is, that the language of the Afghans corresponds, with great and exceptional exactness, to the position in which we should be inclined to place it upon *à priori* grounds, from a mere consideration of the geographical conditions and political history of the country in which it is spoken. We should expect to meet with a language descended from either the ancient speech of India or that of Persia. We should be more inclined, upon geographical grounds, to favour the Persian alternative, as the highlands of Afghanistan, even now called Khorasan by the inhabitants of the plains of the Indus below the passes, and thus, by them, identified with Persia, belong physically to that country rather than to India. At the same time, we should look for the evidences of the language of the Afghans having been powerfully influenced in its formation by the neighbouring dialects of India, as well as by the vernacular form of its more ancient and cultivated language; and we should expect the vocabulary of a mountain tribe, that never worked out its own civilization, but has always adopted that of its settled and powerful neighbours, so far as it is civilized at all, to be fully loaded with importations from those languages in all their different stages. The result which, upon inquiry, we do find, precisely corresponds with all these expectations. There is no reason for doubting that the forms Πακτες and Πακτυῆκῃ χώρα, met with in Herodotus, express the modern national name of Pushtu in the pronunciation of the Eastern Afghans, with whose geographical position they completely coincide. They are of sufficient importance for the contingent supplied by them to the host of Xerxes to be noticed by the Greek historian, at the same time that they do not constitute a special satrapy, nor is any such satrapy mentioned either by Herodotus or in the Behistun or Naksh i Rostam inscriptions. It is probable that they were at this time a mountain tribe of limited extent and importance, situated in the most easterly parts of their present area, upon whom the Achaemenian yoke sat lightly, but dependent upon some one or more of the great adjoining satrapies of Gandāra, Thatagush, Haraiva, Hara'uvātish, or Hindush; settled countries with a population, then, as now, with the exception of the last, almost entirely pure Iranian, and speak-

ing a form of Persian, of which if it were not actual Zend, at all events Zend is the nearest representative that has come down in documents to our time. The distinction between the Pushtu as we now have it and the Persian languages, properly so called, in their various forms and stages, is so deeply and clearly marked, that it is reasonable to conclude that, even at this early period, a considerable difference already existed between the Zend or old Aryan of the plains and the contemporary form of Aryan then spoken by the ancestors of the Afghans, from which the present Pushtu is descended. This separation must have been widened and rendered permanent by the absence of Persian, and great preponderance of Indian, influence, to which Eastern Afghanistan was subject during the whole period between the downfall of Achaemenian power and the rise of Islam. The traces of Græco-Bactrian and Indo-Scythian dominion and influence to be met with in the Pushtu language are imperceptible, but the constant intercourse with India, and the direct Indian rule, which prevailed during most of this period, have left a strong and indelible stamp on Pushtu, not only in its vocabulary, but even in its forms, idiom, and general character. So strong and pervading is this effect, that it is not easy to determine, without minute investigation, whether the Pushtu is to be ranged among the Indian or Iranian dialects. The nature of the words which it has borrowed from the Indian dialects is sufficiently remarkable, as indicating the source whence the Afghans obtained many of the rudiments of civilization and the means of expressing them. *To write*, for instance, is called by the Indian root *likh*, not the Persian *pish*. Even to the present day many insulated tribes in the Hindu Kush, such as the Dir, Tirhai, Laghmani, and Pashai, specimens of whose languages are given by Major Leach, speak dialects of distinct Indian rather than Iranian origin, and therefore ethnologically represent either an actual population of Indian ancestral settlers, or else of a thoroughly Indianized native race. Far more important than all these are the Siāh-pūsh Kafir's of Kafiristan, whose language, as exhibited and illustrated by Dr. Trumpp in a late number of this Journal, is a genuine Indian dialect, and whose physical character, at all events in the instance of the men seen by the Doctor, is no less Indian than their language. The safest general conclusion about the Pushtu would seem to be, that it is the descendant of a language belonging to the western rather than the eastern branch of the true Aryan people, and therefore allied more intimately with Zend than with Sanscrit; but that, during the period of the disintegration of the old Persian languages and the gradual

formation of the modern Persian, it was from political causes far more exposed to Indian than to Persian influences; this period being that in which the spoken Sanskrit language was ceasing to be vernacular in its purest form, and was gradually becoming corrupted into the colloquial Prakrit forms, which are now generally acknowledged to have immediately preceded, and truly and directly given birth to, the modern vernaculars of Northern India. The Neo-Indian dialects, while thus undergoing the process of formation, powerfully affected the Pushtu while itself in the same presumed transitional state, and the Persian does not seem to have recovered its lost influence until it had substantially acquired its modern form under the late Sassanians and in the post-Islamic period. Since then it has modified the whole nature and character of the Pushtu, which in its modern, and especially its literary form, appears entirely recast in a Persian mould. Yet it is quite possible to determine, in a majority of instances, not only whether Pushtu words, of which the affinity with Persian is evident at first sight, have been directly adopted from the latter language, or belong strictly and originally to Pushtu; but even, in the former of these cases, to ascertain within some sort of limits at what period and from what stage of the Persian they have been adopted.

In order to assign to the Pushtu its proper position among the Iranian languages, it is necessary to enumerate briefly, yet with sufficient detail, the different dialects of which that important group consists, according to the most natural classification and arrangement of which they admit. For this purpose it is convenient to assume the Persian language proper as the central unit or standard of comparison, by which to test the nearness and remoteness of the affinity of the rest. This arrangement is natural as well as conventional, for the Persian language covers more time in its records and more space in its distribution than any of the others, and occupies a position central to, continuous with, and directly influencing all, or nearly all, of them. By the Persian language proper is understood, firstly, the old language of the Achaemenian inscriptions, the direct parent of modern Persian, to which may be added the two dialects—whether they be contemporary dialects or successive stages—of the Zend, most intimately allied with old Persian; the transitional dialects spoken during the Sassanian period, comprising the lapidary, numismatic, and literary Pehlevi, in so far as it is Aryan, and stripped of its Semitic element, and the language formerly called Pazend, but now generally known as Parsi, differing very slightly, if at all, from the former, and being the penultimate stage of modern Per-

sian; the classical modern Persian of literature during the Mahometan period, from Firdausi and his immediate predecessors and contemporaries downwards; and, finally, that which has furnished philologists with fewer materials than any, the true living language of modern Iran. It must not be forgotten that Persian is spoken as a native and vernacular language much beyond the limits of the Persian Empire, in the settled parts of Turkistan and Afghanistan, far into the heart of the Chinese Empire, by a population whose Persian origin and agricultural habits are variously indicated in these countries respectively by the names Tājik, Sārt, Dihkān, and Pārsivān. Besides these, the pastoral and nomadic tribes of mountaineers dwelling in the ranges which traverse and inclose the plains of Eastern Persia and Western Afghanistan, of whom the Ēimāk¹ and Hazāra are the principal, are known to speak Persian as their own language. Their native traditions, whatever they may be worth, point to a Turanian rather than an Iranian origin, and one of the four clans of the Ēimāk is actually called Moghul, and speaks a corrupt dialect of Mongol; but the other Ēimāks, the Hazāra, and the settled Tājiks of the plains, all speak the Persian language in an archaic form, which may be generally described as being the Persian of Firdausi. But of the provincialisms, archaisms, and special differences of this Tājik or extra-Iranian Persian, there does not exist any notice whatever in detail, and it would be well worth the while of linguists and scholars in Persia, or the neighbouring countries, to endeavour to form a collection of the kind. One or two vocabularies of the Persian of Bokhara have been compiled and published, but as they were drawn up, not with the object of contrasting Tājik-Persian with Iranian-Persian, but

¹ Generally so pronounced, but written Ēimāk, اوبماق. The word is Turkish, meaning a clan or tribe; چنبار اوبماق, "the four tribes," is the usual Persian name for this race. The word is lost in Osmanli, but survives among some Turkoman tribes of the interior of Asia Minor, by whom the main tribe is called 'ashira, and the next minor subdivision *oymak*. I am indebted for this information to Mr. Edmund Calvert, for a long time resident among the Turkomans of the neighbourhood of Kaisariya. A vocabulary of the dialect of the Moghul Ēimaks drawn up by Major Leach, has somehow given rise to the impression that the whole body of the four Ēimaks speak Mongol, and are of Mongol descent; and they accordingly figure as Mongols in all modern works on language and ethnology. This is quite incorrect, and there is nothing whatever in Leach's words to warrant or give rise to such a supposition. Whatever their descent may be, their language, with the one exception of the Moghul Ēimaks, is exclusively Tājik-Persian.

of showing that the language of Bokhara was Persian rather than something else, they have done more harm than good, as they have served to induce comparative philologists to accept and admit the "langue boukhare" into their essays and vocabularies as an independent dialect, having its own ordinal value, and standing towards Persian in the same relationship, more or less, as Kurdish or Ossetish. The "Fārsi" of Bokhara, in reality, differs from that of Tehran in the same manner and degree as the "Français" of Canada or the Mauritius differs from that of Paris, or the English of Boston from that of London. Each, in the ratio of its consciousness, accepts the metropolitan standard of literature and conversation, each considers itself, and really is, of the same name, form, and virtual identity, with the main branch from which it sprung, and though each may contain many curious provincialisms and archaic expressions, that circumstance of itself does not elevate them to the rank of separate substantial languages, or even dialects.

The dialects standing nearest to Persian, being its genuine sisters, and not modern offsets or corruptions of it, are the Mazanderani, Ghilek, and Talish, spoken in the wooded and mountainous country south of the Caspian. They are closely allied to each other, and form a natural family, which may be conveniently called the Caspian. They are known through some brief specimens of popular poetry published, with notes, by M. Chodzko; the Talish, moreover, through a grammar and vocabulary published at St. Petersburg; the province in which it is spoken being partly Russian. More remote from Persian than the Caspian group, and, respectively, about equidistant from it, stand the languages of the north-west and the south-east frontiers, the Beluchi and the numerous Kurdish dialects. The former, well illustrated in Germany from materials supplied by Major Leach's vocabulary, is unfortunately only known to us as spoken by the Rind Beluchis, the conquerors of Sindh, and it bears many traces of Indian influence accordingly. The dialect of the Nhārūi or western Beluchis, bordering on Kirman and Sistan, has not yet, to the writer's knowledge, been noticed. Regarding the various Kurdish dialects, it would be more convenient to call them by a less limited and more comprehensive term, such as Kurdo-Lurish or Leki, as they are not only spoken in Kurdistan proper, including the area of Kurdish migration and settlement in Asia Minor and Northern Syria, and among the extensive settlements of true Kurds in Northern Khorasan, but by the Lurs and Bakhtyaris of Luristan, and by the whole of those Īlīyāt, or wandering tribes of Persia, who are not

of Turkish race. These latter are called Lek in Persia, and of their distinctive dialect absolutely no record exists. The same may be said of the Lari, for though everybody who has been in the East and inquired into the subject is aware that the Lurs speak Kurdish, yet there is nothing to show in proof of the assertion save a few words in the Kurdish vocabularies in Mr. Rich's work on Kurdistan.

A very peculiar and insulated dialect must be classed in this stage or degree of proximity to Persian. This is the Baraki, spoken by a small hill-tribe in a secluded district of Afghanistan. Their tradition, pointing to a recent Arabian origin and to a language invented for purposes of secrecy by themselves, though accepted by its chronicler, Major Leach, is worthless in presence of the language itself, which is an interesting and in many points truly archaic Iranian dialect. *Kshār*, for instance, Persian *shahr*, old Persian *khshatram*, *ksha*, the number six, Zend *ksvas*, Persian *shash*, *shish*, which could not, of course, have been invented out of nothing, could not, any more, have been adopted from the local Tājik Persian of the plains, from which the old initial compound sound must have disappeared long prior to Islam. Leach only gives a vocabulary and dialogue, without any outline of the grammar, but the construction of sentences, as shown in the dialogue, is far less Iranian and more Turanian than would be expected from the wholly Iranian forms and words of this language.

Next come the two well known Ossetian dialects, which have now for some time attracted the attention of European scholars, owing to their outlying and insulated position in the Caucasus, and to their unexpected philological affinities. They have been fully illustrated by the labours of Rosen and Sjögren. The numerous Indian characteristics, and the strongly marked sound-system of the Pushtu, and the special and peculiar nature of much of its vocabulary, serve to remove it further from Persian than any of the dialects previously mentioned. Yet it does not close the list, and upon the whole, after due consideration, the extreme position among the Iranian dialects should probably be reserved for the Armenian; the affinities of which to Persian, nevertheless, are numerous, clear, and undoubted.

The above enumeration, it is believed, will be found to have comprised the whole circle of Iranian dialects that have come down to us, and that are, at present, known to exist. They are all of them closely connected with one another, and each one of them is capable of supplying great and effectual aid in throwing light upon the difficulties and explaining the peculiarities of any or all of the

others. Pushtu, obviously, and, as a matter of course, has to be illustrated by Persian, but the dialects are also capable of rendering it equally efficient services. Dr. Dorn has thus drawn useful comparisons from the Caspian dialects in two or three instances, and would have done so more fully had it been his object in that place to explain, rather than to state, the rules of Pushtu grammar. The principal end with which the Persian dialects have been examined in the preceding survey, has been to show how very scanty, after all, are the materials which lie at the disposal of the philologist for their due investigation, and to stimulate the linguist who may read these pages, and who may have opportunities for such researches, to dig and quarry in a valuable mine which, so far from having been exhausted, is as yet in many places unworked and undisturbed.
